AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 7.

Attachments: Replacement sheet

Annotated sheet showing changes

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-13 remain pending in the application following entry of the foregoing amendment. Claim 2 is cancelled, its limitations being incorporated into claim 1. Claim 3 is amended to change its dependency based upon the cancellation of claim 2. Claims 5 and 10 are merely amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Now new matter is believed to be added by these amendments.

Objection to the Drawings

The action objected to the drawings, and in particular, that the connection between the ROM TABLE 520 and the multiplier 521 in Fig. 7 is missing. This response proposes an amendment to Fig. 7 to show the missing connection. The error is obvious, and furthermore the connection is described in the specification, as noted by the examiner. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added by this amendment. Annotated and replacement sheets are provided.

Information Disclosure Statement

The action indicates that the Hynix Semiconductor, Inc. reference (10-2002-061734) cited in July 30, 2003 Information Disclosure Statement was not considered as a copy of the reference was not provided with the IDS. In fact, the cited reference is the priority application of the instant application, and as such, the cited reference is not and cannot be prior art to the instant application. Also, a copy of the priority document was provided with the application and acknowledged as received by the examiner in the action. Hence, the applicant submits it is unnecessary to provide an additional copy either with this response or via a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Parargaph

The action rejected claims 5-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the examiner alleges that claims 5-13 contain a summation over 0 to N-1, where N is an integer; however,

that the specification does not disclose how one is to set the value N in the claimed equation (eq. 2 in the specification).

By this response the applicant amends 5 and 10 to clarify the equation. In particular, the summation is amended to occur over 0 to L-1, where L is the bit number of the digital signal of the analog-to-digital converting means and the exponential denominator is the general value 2^L-1 instead of 255. As stated at page 13, lines 23-26 of the specification, an exemplary analog-to-digital converter (ADC) may be an 8-bit ADC. Equation 2 in the specification shows the denominator as 255, i.e., 2^8-1 or 2^L-1, where L is the bit number of the ADC. The summation is then carried out over the bit number. As such, the applicant submits the amendments to claims 5 and 10 are supported by the specification and add no new matter, and furthermore, the applicant submits that the proposed amendments overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4 are rejected in the action under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Smith et al. (WO 00/07363, hereinafter "Smith"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

The action states that Smith disclose a pixel column including P number of columns allocated at both sides of a pixel group. However, referring to page 6 of Smith, they only disclose that "image data for each row which has been averaged (i.e., where the pixel values of each row have been averaged)." As such, Smith do not disclose a location of the pixel column.

In particular, Smith do not disclose, teach or suggest the pixel column including P number of columns allocated at both sides of the pixel group. As such, Smith cannot anticipate or render obvious claims 1 and 10. Thus, these claims are allowable over Smith. Furthermore, claims 3-9 and 11-13, depending from claim 1 and 10, respectfully, are also allowable.

8

Therefore, the applicant submits that the application is in a condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Dated: January 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony G. Sitko/
Anthony G. Sitko
    Registration No.: 36,278
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments